

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of February 26, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are Applicant's response thereto. Claims 19, 21-34, 36-41, and 45-51 are pending. Claims 19, 21-24, 28, 29, 34-39, 41, 45-49 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,265 to Rangan *et al.* (Rangan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,906 to Yang (Yang) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,332,127 to Bandera *et al.* (Bandera). Claims 25-27, 30-33 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan in view of Yang and in further view of Bandera and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,9335 to Saha *et al.* (Saha). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicant's representatives would like to express their appreciation for the time taken by the Examiner to discuss this case. In particular, the feature "displaying a link to a resource with a mobile terminal, wherein the link is related to a product and a position of the link is in a video displayed on the mobile terminal and corresponds to an image of the product, wherein the video is received via the digital broadcasting network" was discussed. Applicant's representatives noted that after carefully reviewing the Yang reference, no support for the Office Action's position that Yang disclosed receiving video over a digital network was discovered. Instead it appeared that Yang only disclosed receiving video over a conventional analog network. After some further discussion, the Examiner agreed that Yang did not disclose such a feature and agreed to withdrawal the current rejection.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a)**

All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the Rangan, Yang and Bandera, with or without Saha.

As previously noted, none of the cited references teach a device capable of performing the recited features of claim 19, for example. The Office Action does not dispute this point. In particular, claim 19 recites the following feature:

displaying a link to a resource with a mobile terminal, wherein the link is related to a product and a position of the link is in a video displayed on the mobile terminal and corresponds to an image of the product, wherein the video is received via the digital broadcasting network;

(emphasis added). The Office Action relies on Rangan as the primary reference. However, Rangan teaches high performance hypervideo. Rangan, Col. 5, Ln. 65 – Col. 6, Ln. 4. To provide this performance, Rangan teaches the use of a cable modem and a Pentium class computer. Rangan, Col. 6, Ln. 36-42. Rangan did not suggest that a mobile device could provide this type of performance. The Office Action admits that Rangan does not disclose a mobile device. The Office Action pointed to Yang as correcting this deficiency and argued that Yang discloses receiving video from a digital broadcasting network. As was agreed to during the interview with the Examiner, however, this position is not supported by the Yang reference. Accordingly, the Office Action's rejection, which depends on Yang disclosing this feature, is not supported. Therefore, the references of record fail to disclose, suggest or teach all the features recited in claim 19. Accordingly, as claim 19 recites at least one feature not disclosed, suggested or taught by the references of record, claim 19 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 21-27 and 45 depend from claim 19 and are patentable over the references of record for at least the reasons that claim 19 is patentable and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 28 recites the feature "a receiver that is configured to receive digital broadcasting over the digital broadcasting network" and as discussed above with respect to claim 19, the references of record fail to disclose this feature. For example, Yang merely discloses a mobile terminal that is configured to receive convention analog TV broadcasting. Therefore, as it cannot fairly be said that the references of record disclose, suggest or teach this feature, claim 28 is patentable in view of the references of record.

Claims 29-33 and 46 depend from claim 28 and are patentable over the references of record for at least the reasons that claim 28 is patentable and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 34 recites the feature of a processor that is configured take actions that include "providing a link to a resource to a mobile terminal over the mobile communication network,

wherein the link is related to a product and a position of the link is in a video displayed on the mobile terminal and corresponds to an image of the product in the video displayed on the mobile terminal, and wherein the video is transmitted by a digital broadcasting network.” For at least the reasons discussed above, the references of record fail to disclose a processor so configured. Accordingly, claim 34 is patentable in view of the references of record.

Claim 47 depends from claim 34 and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons that claim 34 is patentable and for the additional features recite therein.

Claim 36 recites the feature of a mobile terminal that is configured to perform the action “displaying a link to a resource, wherein the link is related to a product and a position of the link is in a video displayed on the mobile terminal and corresponds to an image of the product, wherein the video is received from the digital broadcasting transmitter over the digital broadcasting network.” For reasons similar to the reasons discussed above, the references of record fail to disclose, suggest or teach this feature. Accordingly, claim 36 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 37-40 and 48 depend from claim 36 are therefore patentable for at least the reasons that claim 36 is patentable and for the additional features recite therein.

Claim 41 recites the feature of “a receiver that is configured to receive digital broadcasting over the digital broadcasting network.” For reasons similar to the reasons discussed above, the references of record fail to disclose this feature of claim 41. Accordingly, claim 41 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 49 depends from claim 41 and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons that claim 41 is patentable and for the additional features recite therein.

Claim 50 is directed to a method that includes the step of “providing a link over the mobile communication network to the mobile terminal, the link associated with a resource and a product in a video that is being displaying on the mobile terminal, wherein the video is provided by a digital broadcasting network.” Applicants assert that for at least the reasons discussed above, this step is not performed and/or possible in any of the cited reference. Therefore, none of the references of record disclose, suggest or teach this step. Accordingly, claim 50 is patentable over the references of record.

Claims 51 depends from claim 50 and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons that claim 50 is patentable and for the additional features recite therein.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 11, 2006

By: /Stephen L. Sheldon/  
Stephen L. Sheldon  
Registration No. 58,732

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606-7407  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001